



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1995

No. 72

## Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, May 1, 1995)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chaplain will now deliver the morning prayer.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

*Commit your way to the Lord, trust also in Him and He shall bring it to pass . . . Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him.—Psalm 37:5, 7.*

Gracious Lord, Your spirit is impinging on us, hovering all around us, ready to enter into us and give us power to live this day to the fullest. You have shown us that commitment is the key to open the floodgate and receive the inflow of Your incredible resources for living with peak performance today. Remind us that there is enough time and You will provide enough strength to do what You have called us to accomplish today. You never intended that we carry either the burdens or the opportunities of leadership alone.

May this day be one of constant conversation with You. Lord, help us to listen to You as You give us Your insight, discernment, wisdom, and vision. Help us to picture and claim Your best for our lives, the people around us and our Nation. Focus our attention on Your solutions to our problems. We commit this day to be a day in which we work with freedom and with joy. Thank You in advance for supernatural power.

In the name that is above every name. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this morning, the leader time has been reserved, and there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 10:15 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

At 10:15 a.m., the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 956, the product liability bill.

At that time, there will be 60 minutes of debate to be equally divided between the two managers. At the hour of 11:15, the Senate will begin a series of stacked votes on or in relation to second-degree amendments to the Dole amendment. Further rollcall votes can be expected today, and the Senate may be in session into the evening to make progress on the product liability bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

### THE AGENDA AND OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to continue our dialog that we, the freshmen, have had seeking to talk about the agenda, to talk about the opportunities that we have for the first time in 40 years to have a real oppor-

tunity to take a look at the programs that have been in place, programs that have simply been added to over a period of time, programs, obviously that had merit in the beginning, have some merit yet. But we have an opportunity to look at them, to look at ways to make them more effective and more efficient.

We have an opportunity to respond to voters who, I think, in November said we want change, we need to make a change in Government. I think one of the measures of good Government is whether or not Government is responsive to the kinds of messages that we receive from voters.

We want to take an opportunity to make Government programs work better. I think, unfortunately, there sometimes is a perception when you talk about change that those who want change simply want to toss out the programs and do nothing. That is not the case. The case is how do we do a better job of providing services to people? How do we be more effective?

Welfare is an excellent example. No one is talking about throwing women and children and welfare fathers out on the street. What we are talking about is helping people to help themselves, find a way to be more efficient and to put people back into the workplace. That is what we are talking about.

So we are talking about bringing the Government closer to the people—block grants to the States, moving more responsibilities to the States—so people can participate more in their Government.

I do not think there is any question but what the voters in November said we want less Government and it should be less costly, that Government is too big and Government is too expensive.

So, Mr. President, that is the kind of agenda that the 11 of us who are new to this body would like to pursue. Those are the kinds of things that we believe

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S 6019

should be considered and should be changed.

All of us have had a 2-week recess. I was in Wyoming for that entire 2 weeks and, I must tell you, I come back reinforced and rededicated to the idea that we need change. I heard from nearly everyone there: "We are pleased with what has begun in Washington. We are pleased with the ideas." Certainly not everybody agrees with every detail. But the fact is that at least in my experience, people want us to move forward.

To do that we are going to have to continue to make clear, I think, the perception of what we are seeking to do. And the opposition, those who are opposed to change, and obviously the direction and the agenda of the administration is to say to people who are asking for change, all they want to do is do away with programs. Their notion is going to be to create fear—fear of change—and we are going to have to do something about that.

I think there are great debates, there are differences in view, clearly, of how people see the world, and there is a great deal of difference right here in this body among the Members. Some believe, genuinely and legitimately, that more Government is better, that we ought to have more money to spend, that the Government does a better job of spending money than do the taxpayers. On the other hand, most of us do not agree with that notion and want to make it smaller.

There is a legitimate debate and there is a great debate. So we have an agenda, and in order to do that, Mr. President, we are going to have to move through that agenda. I respect the purpose of the Senate in terms of its ability to go into depth and it is a deliberative body, and that should be the case. But it should not be an obstructionist body. It should not be a body that simply ties up this great debate, but rather it ought to be out there and we ought to have an agenda and we ought to move forward.

There are a number of things, certainly, that we clearly ought to talk about. We are talking about one of them now, and that is tort reform, something that needs to be done. We need also to talk about welfare reform. That is a legitimate thing we ought to do. We ought to take another look at crime. Clearly, health care needs some revision. We need to have regulatory reform. We need to balance the budget.

These are the agenda items that we have a responsibility, Mr. President, to undertake. I think if those of us who were elected this year have any message, the message is let us move forward with these issues, let us talk about these issues. We are willing to accept the results, of course. But we are not willing to accept the idea that we do not have an agenda, that we are not going to deal with the questions that the American people have asked, that we are simply going to take up all our time in obstructionist kinds of ac-

tivities, that the rapid response team is always going to be opposed to change. So that is where we are, Mr. President. I think we have the greatest opportunity, and I thought that last month. And I have to tell you, having spent 2 weeks in Wyoming, that notion, in my view, is simply reinforced that people do want us to go forward.

Mr. President, I am not sure of the agenda. But the freshmen had a certain amount of time.

I yield to my associate from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

#### THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator for yielding. I would like to address a specific issue in the next 100 days in the Senate that I think is going to attract a lot of attention. It has already attracted a lot of attention. It is an issue of great importance to this country and people rely on this program—that is the Medicare Program. There is a lot of discussion going on in this town—and I hope across America—about Medicare and where it fits in with the scheme of things here in Washington.

Is Medicare going to be used to balance the budget? Is Medicare a program that is in trouble? What is the truth? What is the real story and who do you believe? Unfortunately, in Washington, that is a problem we have a lot, which is that every issue, irrespective of the importance of the issue, turns into a partisan battle, and one side says one thing and the other side says another. You would think with an issue such as Medicare, with the information we have before us, that we could act as adults and face the problem squarely, maturely, discuss it, debate it, and come up with a solution to the problem.

But as is the case around here all too often, political gain comes before responsible action. We have folks who think we can make political gains from Medicare, so let us delay responsible action for a while and see how much hey we can make in the process.

Here are the facts. The facts are that the Medicare trustees issued a report that says that Medicare will be insolvent by the year 2002. In other words, it will not have any money left in the trust fund to pay out benefits to anyone. That is not 25 years or 30 years from now, which is the problem of Social Security. Americans seem to be tuned into that Social Security is in trouble in the long term and that we cannot sustain it. The insolvency of Social Security is a little over 30 years away. It is a problem and we have to deal with that. We have a little bit more time.

Medicare is an immediate problem. Medicare runs out of money in 7 years. You would think, as I said, as mature adults elected here to govern the country, we could sit down and accept that,

accept the findings of the trustees. Four out of the six Medicare trustees are Clinton administration officials. They have issued this report that says, "The Medicare trust fund will be able to pay benefits for only 7 years and is severely out of financial balance in the long-range."

That is what this chart shows. Here is where the Medicare trust fund is exhausted, 2002. Here is the gap. It grows and grows. This is the revenue shortfall. It only gets worse, particularly in the outyears when the baby boomers start to retire.

There are less people working to support the Medicare trust fund. It is obvious that we have to do something; it is obvious that the time to act is now while we have a meager surplus that is going to be exhausted, as I said before, in 7 years. You would think that we could come to the table, accept the Clinton administration's own findings that this is a problem that must be solved, accept their own recommendation—again, the recommendation of the trustees—that says we need urgent action. But, no, you are going to see the big dance that goes on around here, the big dance on how we are going to scare seniors, lie to them; and anybody who wants to touch Medicare is not going to try to save Medicare. Oh, no, they just want to take the program away from them. They want to ruin Medicare. They want to break their promises to the American public.

Why? Why would people say things that are blatantly false? Why would they say that? Well, it is certainly not to preserve the trust fund, certainly not to make sure Medicare is there for future generations—I should not even say future—this generation of seniors. That certainly is not the reason they are saying it. Why are they saying it? Very simple: Political gain.

Political gain. It is a tried and true American maxim in American politics, and that is if you can square seniors enough so that they will vote against the other side who wants to take their programs away, you can win elections and then after the election, you will discover the problem. After the election is over, after you have reaped the benefits by scaring seniors that these bad guys out here who want to touch Medicare are out really to kill the program, after you have accomplished the scare tactics and succeeded in victory, then come to the floor, come to the American people after the election, after you have won and lied, and after you have accomplished what you wanted, and then say, look, the Medicare trust fund is going to be out of money, we have to do something. That is what is going to happen. That is what happened on Social Security in 1982. It is going to try to happen in 1996.

I just hope—I really hope—that the American public is smart enough to see through these scare tactics, not only by the Clinton administration, by the Democrats here in Congress, by these